

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/780,159	02/17/2004	Joseph DeMeo	KN P 0155 1270		
42016 KENSEY NAS	7590 09/25/2007 SH CORPORATION		EXAM	EXAMINER	
735 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE		CHEN, VIVIAN			
EXTON, PA 19341		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•		1773		
		•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/780,159	DEMEO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vivian Chen	1773	

= 0.0.0 till i iiiig 0. dii i ippodi 2.10.	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vivian Chen	1773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 September 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI		•	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31: or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.	٠	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire!	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office laternay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing that the mailing date the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropri	iate extension fee ce action: or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	olionaa with 27 CED 44 27 must be	filed within two mounts	
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo			
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bei appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	noted alaima	
NOTE: <u>see Detailed Advisory Action</u> . (See 37 CFI		scied ciainis.	
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		maliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphant Amendment (,PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-	igtimes will not be entered, or b) $igsqcup$ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	·		
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,23,24,28-31 and 33-40</u> .	•		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>22 and 41</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to comment. 	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	y and was not earlier presented. So	ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	1).
IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		-	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see Detailed Advisory Action. 		condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
•		Vivian Chen Primary Examiner	

Art Unit: 1773

Application/Control Number: 10/780,159 Page 2

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ADVISORY ACTION

1. Claims 5-21, 25-27, 32 have been cancelled by Applicant.

Response to Proposed Amendments

- 1. The proposed amendments will <u>NOT</u> be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The newly added claim limitations with respect to the presence of a common longitudinal axis and a common axis of orientation have not been previously presented or claimed.
- 1. The proposed amendments will <u>NOT</u> be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search and because they raise the issue of new matter because there is a lack of support in the specification as originally filed with respect to requiring a common axis of orientation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-4, 23-24, 28-31, 33-40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NAKAMURA ET AL (US 2003/0146541), in view of BURKHEAD ET AL (US 2001/0004693),

because the proposed amendments have **NOT** been entered.

Application/Control Number: 10/780,159 Page 3

Art Unit: 1773

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 9/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- (A) Applicant's arguments with respect to the presence (or lack thereof) of a common longintudinal axis featuring a common axis of molecular orientation are deemed moot because the proposed amendments have <u>NOT</u> been entered.
- (B) Applicant argues that the phrase "a longitudinal axis" inherently references to a single or common longitudinal axis. However, the Examiner is not persuaded because the term "a longitudinal axis" by itself does not inherently require that the longitudinal axis of the head and the longitudinal axis of the shank portion be the one and the same. The phrase "arranged on a longitudinal axis" may be reasonably interpreted as simply specifying that each portion has a distinguishable "lengthwise" direction.
- (C) Applicant argues that BURKHEAD fails to disclose a device wherein the head and the shank are arranged on a longitudinal axis. As an initial matter BURKHEAD is primarily relied upon to illustrate that it is well known in the art to form implantable articles with different degrees of orientation in different regions. With respect to Applicant's argument that the head portion of BURKHEAD is not "arranged on" the longitudinal axis, while the head portion contains an element which deviates from the overall longitudinal axis of the device, that does not obviate the fact that the head portion as a whole is situated at the tip of the shank, and therefore may be reasonably considered to be "arranged on" the overall longitudinal axis of the device (i.e., placed in a position in the lengthwise direction). Accepting Applicant's interpretation of "arranged on a longitudinal axis" would means that absolutely no part or element of the head

Page 4

Art Unit: 1773

portion can deviate from or have an axis different from the longitudinal axis, thereby excluding any device in which the head portion has a diameter is greater than its shank diameter, because according to Applicant's particular interpretation, such head portions are not arranged on a longitudinal axis with the shank portion. For example, Applicant's interpretation would appear to preclude devices having widened head portions as denoted by reference number 6 in Applicant's own Figures.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney, can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

The General Information telephone number for Technology Center 1700 is (571) 272-1700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 18, 2007

Vivian Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773